



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

fw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,761	10/07/2003	Peter T. Stern	MSFT10	5223
27488	.7590	12/08/2006		EXAMINER
				NGUYEN, KEVIN M
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2629

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/680,761	STERN, PETER T.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Kevin M. Nguyen	2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/7/2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Response to Amendment***

1. Response to applicant's amendment/argument filed on 9/27/2006. Claims 1, 9 and 16-20 are amended. Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-12, with respect to the amended claims 1-20 have been fully considered and are not persuasive, and necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

***Drawings***

2. The drawings were received on 9/27/2006. This drawing (figure 3) is acknowledged.

***Specification***

3. Amendment to specification filed 9/27/2006 which has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 7-13, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton (US 6,595,781) in view of Bier (US 5,561,811).

6. As to claim 1, Sutton discloses a system for providing an interactive collaborative display in an educational environment [see abstract, a first embodiment of Fig. 2], the system comprising:

a processing unit [a computer 4, Fig. 2];

a data storage unit, operable for storing a plurality of instructions for the processing unit [a storage device, 8, Fig. 2];

a large format collaboration display [*a large display screen 5, Fig. 2*], wherein the large format collaboration display [5] is configured to displays a plurality of documents [*educational content notes have been written on the digitizing board 5 and 3, col. 8, lines 31-42*], and accept simultaneous input from a plurality of users in at least one of plurality of the documents [*other input devices shown in Fig. 2 will be activated (and their outputs stored) in synchronism only during selected periods during the educational presentation, col. 9, lines 7-11*].

Accordingly, Sutton discloses all of the claimed limitation, except for support multiple customizable cursors representing interaction of the plurality of users each of the plurality of users having each of the multiple customizable cursors.

However, Bier discloses a plurality of users invoke the same command in the same application by taking comparable action using comparable, but distinct, input devices. Customized or registered each of the input devices with each of the plurality of users, each input device associated with each customizable cursor in col. 2, lines 24-50.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sutton to make the plurality of users invoke the same command in the same application by taking comparable action using comparable, but distinct, input devices. Customized or registered each of the input devices with each of the plurality of users, each input device associated with each customizable cursor as

taught by Bier, because this would provide per-user feedback without unduly disturbing other users, while reducing interference between users (see Bier, col. 7, lines 45-53).

6. As to claim 7, Sutton discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising a communications unit, operable for transmitting and receiving content over a distributed network [see a second embodiment of Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 57-62. It is noted that the second embodiment of Fig. 3 incorporated into the first embodiment of Fig. 2, col. 10, lines 25-34].

7. As to claim 8, Sutton discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising a plurality of educational application programs supporting educational standards selected from the list consisting essentially of K-12 Extensible Markup Language (XML) schema [Hyper-Text Markup Language (HML), col. 14, lines 1-19. It is noted that XML and HTML are the same, see [http://www.reference.com/browse/wiki/Standard\\_Generalized\\_Markup\\_Language](http://www.reference.com/browse/wiki/Standard_Generalized_Markup_Language)].

8. As to claim 9, Sutton discloses a method for sharing information between a plurality of users though a large format collaborative display, the method comprising:

registering at least one user [*enrolled student/user, col. 13, lines 14-16*];

receiving at least one input signal from the registered user [*navigating, clicking and dragging the slider (75) by the enrolled student, an alternate embodiment of Fig. 8C, col. 28, line 3-5*];

displaying at least one document in the large format collaborative display in response to an input signal from the registered user [*displaying the notes taken frame*

*66 for entering by the enrolled user/student while viewing an educational program, Fig. 8B, col. 18, lines 54-63];*

associating at least one input device with each registered user [*other input devices is used during selected periods the educational representation, col. 9, lines 7-16. It would have been obvious to recognize that at least one of the other input devices associated with the enrolled student/user as claimed*];

receiving an input signal through at least one input device in contact with a touch screen overlay placed on the large format collaborative display [*entering/writing on digitizing board 22 while viewing an educational program, see Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 63 through col. 11, line 2*];

storing the input signal in the document and associating the stored input signals with the registered user [*storing the writing in the digital content of educational program associated with the student took notes in the storage device 24, see Fig. 3, col. 11, lines 3-12, and col. 18, lines 54-60*];

sharing the stored document with at least one other user [notes taken frame 66 is sharing with the other user see Fig. 8B, col. 18, lines 54-63].

Accordingly, Sutton discloses all of the claimed limitation, except wherein the large format display comprises a resistive touch screen overlay, wherein the input signal comprises a customizable cursor representing each of the at least one user.

However, Bier conventionally discloses a large screen display, which includes a conductive resistor film, is inherently in the touch screen, which is touched by the stylus in col. 1, lines 52-55, and col. 2, lines 3-5. Bier teaches a plurality of users invoke the

same command in the same application by taking comparable action using comparable, but distinct, input devices. Customized or registered each of the input devices with each of the plurality of users, each input device associated with each customizable cursor in col. 2, lines 24-50.

9. As to claim 20, the system of claim 1, the selection of the multiple customizable cursor occurs during a first time a user registers with system and becomes part of the user's profile information, whereas Bier teaches it must be possible to quickly register each input device with a user, and hence, with a set of preferences in col. 2, lines 35-37.

10. As to claim 10, Sutton discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising: displaying a video image of the user in at least a portion of the large format collaborative display [at least on notes taken frame 66 on the large display screen, see Fig. 8B, col. 18, lines 54-60].

11. As to claim 11, Bier conventionally discloses comprising displaying the document in real time at another large format collaborative display at a remote location over a distributed network in col. 1, lines 40-48.

12. As to claim 12, Sutton discloses the method of claim 10, further comprising displaying the video image of the registered user in at least a portion of the large format collaborative displays located at the remote sites in real-time [see Fig. 8C, col. 17, lines 10-27].

13. As to claim 13, Sutton discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the large format collaboration display comprises:

a resizable display area [35, 36, 38], a resizable real-time communications area for monitoring communications with other students at remote locations; a resizable collaboration area for sharing documents with other users [see col. 14, lines 47-56].

14. As to claim 15, Bier discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the large format collaborative display is selected from a list consisting essentially of a cathode ray tube (CRT) display [*his present invention applied to a type a conventional computer monitor or a CRT display, see col. 4, lines 40-42*].

15. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sutton to make the plurality of users invoke the same command in the same application by taking comparable action using comparable, but distinct, input devices. Customized or registered each of the input devices with each of the plurality of users, each input device associated with each customizable cursor as taught by Bier, because this would provide per-user feedback without unduly disturbing other users, while reducing interference between users (see Bier, col. 7, lines 45-53).

16. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton in view of Bier as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ogino et al (US 5,818,421) hereinafter Ogino.

As to claim 2, the combination of Sutton and Bier discloses all of the claimed limitation of claim 1, except wherein the large format display comprises a resistive touch screen overlay.

However, Ogino discloses a large screen display which includes a conductive resistor film is added onto a light-transmission screen (see col. 5, lines 10-13). Ogino further discloses his present invention applying to a projection type LCD display (see col. 5, lines 27-34).

As to claim 4, Ogino discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the large format collaboration display is selected from a list consisting essentially of a liquid crystal display (LCD). See col. 5, lines 27-33, disclosing, the present invention can be applied to a liquid crystal panel.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the display of Sutton and Bier to become the liquid crystal panel including the resistive touch screen as disclosed by Ogino in order to achieve the benefit of improving the position pointing being touched more precise (see Ogino, col. 5, lines 43-45).

17. Claims 3, 5, 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton in view of Bier as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Takekawa (US 6,823,481).

18. As to claims 3 and 14, the combination of Sutton and Bier discloses all of the claimed limitation of claims 1 and 9, except wherein the large format display is a high definition plasma display.

However, Takekawa discloses an electronic blackboard unit 4 including a large-sized PDP (Plasma Display Panel) 2 and a coordinate input/detection device 3 (see Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 60-66).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the plasma display panel (2) as disclosed by Takekawa with the large format display of the combination of Sutton and Bier in order to achieve the benefit of intending to utilize in wide areas such as meeting, a presentation and an educational scene (see Takekawa, col. 2, lines 9-16), because this would improve the quality of a position of a light spot that have been touched on a screen more accurate without any recognition errors (see Takekawa, col. 3, lines 6-15).

19. As to claim 5, Sutton discloses the system of claim 3, wherein the large format collaboration display comprises: a resizable display area [35, 36, 38]; a resizable real-time communications area for monitoring communications with other students at remote locations; a resizable collaboration area for sharing documents with other users [see col. 14, lines 47-56];

20. As to claim 6, Sutton discloses the system of claim 3, further comprising a plurality of input devices for simultaneous inputting signals from a plurality of users, wherein each input device comprises identifying indicia (corresponding to mouse/pointer icons 96) for identifying the user associated with the particular input device in figure 5C, col. 16, lines 30-40.

21. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton in view of Bier as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Swanson et al (US 5,600,778 hereafter Swanson).

As to claims 16-18, the combination of Sutton and Bier teaches all of the claimed limitation of claim 1, except wherein the multiple customizable cursors comprise cursors

selected from a library, wherein the cursors selected from a library comprises various colors, wherein the cursors selected from a library comprise various symbols.

Swanson teaches to customize for selecting the custom cursors from the pointers set, various colors, and different symbols in figures 10, 14, col. 19, lines 28-39.

As to claim 19, the system of claim 1, wherein the multiple customizable cursors are created in any application that is capable of exporting at least one of the following image formats bitmaps (BMP) file formats, whereas Swanson discloses the cursors files, which are under subdirectories bitmaps files in figure 14.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sutton and Bier to select the cursors from the system's pointers, various colors, and different symbols as taught by Swanson because this would provide an opportunity for users to selectively modify resource values of interest in a highly efficient way (see Swanson, col. 3, lines 50-52).

### ***Response to Arguments***

23. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN M. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-7697. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THU from 9:00-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, a supervisor RICHARD A. HJERPE can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the Patent Application Information Retrieval system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin M. Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 262929

KMN  
December 6, 2006



RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600